

Questions for the CARB Governing Board

- Beyond making key investments in transformational zero emission technologies which we all support, how do we lock in more near-term NOx reductions to help our struggling air districts who have 5 years to meet federal ozone attainment deadlines with the \$423mm of funds?
- How many NOx tons per year does the South Coast and the San Joaquin Valley alone need to reduce from mobile sources between now and 2023 and how important is it for us to reduce emissions from heavy-duty trucks today? Shouldn't we apply more money from this one-time fund that is intended to mitigate NOx impacts caused by a diesel engine defeat device to reduce both NOx and toxic diesel PM now? Shouldn't this program deliver a greater public health benefit than just 10,000 NOx tons per year, especially when you have districts like the South Coast that need to reduce NOx emissions by 45% over the next 5 years?
- The \$60 million allocated to "combustion freight" category is estimated to mitigate 71% of the 10,000 NOx tons per year required by US EPA. What if we spent \$80 or \$100mm on combustion freight, how much more emissions would be achieved to help struggling air districts that have little or no authority over mobile sources?
- Just using a linear projection of NOx mitigation based on staff's analysis, it seems NOx mitigation could jump from roughly 7,100 NOx tons to 9,500 NOx tons if \$80mm were spent or 11,830 NOx tons if \$100mm were spent on combustion freight.
- Even if \$100 million was spent on combustion freight, would CARB not still have over \$320+ million left to dedicate to transformational zero emission technologies? Shouldn't we have a more balanced program?
- While it is true that other programs like Carl Moyer, Prop 1B or HVIP allocates money to low NOx trucks but don't these same programs also offer incentives to transformational zero emission technologies as well?

Todd Campbell
18-4-4

ACT Expo2018: General Session - Wayne Nastri Excerpt on deploying technology

From the perspective of deploying the technology in a cost effective manner, that's something we have an obligation, right? 2023 isn't that far away.

When we look at the state of technology, especially zero-emission technology, we know that in general, battery electric technology is about three times as much. So, am I going to have to forego a threefold reduction in emission benefits in a disadvantaged community because our overall policy is to go with zero-emission? That's not right.

And yet probably one of the biggest drivers are community activists who want to see absolutely no fossil fuels used in disadvantaged communities, even if it means increased exposure to the residents in their community.

And, I'm just shocked because our whole purpose is to protect public health. If I can get those reductions today, why would we forego those reductions?

Now, I understand the policy aspect in terms of we do want to drive technology. We do want to make sure that everyone enjoys the benefits associated with that technology. But, we also have SIP requirements, state implementation plan requirements, where we could face penalties; we could face a whole host of actions. Yet, where are we from the policy perspective?

The VW settlement funds, we're not able to use really in a cost effective way because we're trying to develop a policy. And that is a much broader discussion.

Are we, as a state, or we as a regional agency, willing to forego some of those benefits?

I think that's what communities are actually getting very involved with, in terms of whether its infrastructure, whether it's where freights are domicile, they want to understand, what are the technology implications? What are the direct impacts to them?

We're seeing that not only through the traditional way that we approach air quality, but through new programs, Assembly Bill 617, where we have to get risk reduction in communities.

We know the biggest driver is diesel particulate. So, let's get rid of the diesel particulate, and do it in a way that we like to think is cost effective and still drive policy in a certain way.

But, I don't think we should sacrifice reductions and human health benefits at the sole exclusion of just driving a zero-emission policy. It has got to be a combination, and we have got to realize a transition over time when the market allows that.